First Name: Stephen Last Name: Blagden

Email Address: Srbz@aol.com
Affiliation: La Habra Heights
Date Received: 2/2/2009

Subject: Comments on draft guidelines

Hello

1. One of the areas in the Guidelines that should be covered better is the project description.

EIRs require a more comprehensive description of the project than for a Neg Dec or Mitigated Neg Dec. All should require the same project description detail, because what the lead agency may be saying requires a Neg Dec, could actually require an EIR. A good project description enables the public to be able to quickly understand if more inquiry about a project may be required.

2. When the lead agency is also the one doing the project better clarity and specificity in the guidelines would be helpful.

This has the broadest implications when the Zoning/Development Code is being amended or revised. Cumulative effects usually are the greatest effects of Code changes when a Code change applies to a whole city or zone.

Development Codes can have the greatest impacts on GHG and other environmental effects, yet the Guidelines are almost silent on them.

Court decisions, such as "WalMart vs City of Turlock", provides case law that could be incorporated into the Guidelines as to what cities and counties need to do to discover foreseeable environmental impacts of Code changes, when those changes will have a direct or indirect effect on the environment.

As an example, the city I live in does not consider foreseeable environmental impacts of Code changes, stating that there is no project before them, and they will consider the impacts when a project application comes in. While this is contrary to the case law, there is nothing in the Guidelines to point to to let them know they need to study impacts prior to Code adoption.

Please add language to the guidelines describing or directing that local agencies need to study foreseeable environmental effects of Code changes prior to their adoption.

Thanks

Stephen Blagden La Habra Heights